REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this application, as amended herein. Claims 1-21 were pending in the application. In this amendment, Claims 5 and 9 have been canceled, Claims 1, 2, 11, 18, and 21 have been amended; and no new claims have been added. Therefore, Claims 1-4, 6-8, and 10-21 are pending in the application.

Drawings

The Examiner objected to the drawings stating that the boxes should have labels in addition to the reference numerals. Authorization is hereby requested to replace Figure 1, as shown in the attached proposed drawing page. Submitted herewith is one (1) sheet of formal drawings in connection with the application having labels added, as appropriate. All the elements are shown in Figure 1 and identified in the specification in paragraphs [0022] through [0026] of the published application, thus it is respectfully submitted that no new matter has been entered.

The Objection

The Examiner objected to the Abstract as using legal phraseology. Applicant submits herewith an amended paragraph to replace the Abstract as originally filed. Applicant respectfully requests that the objection be withdrawn.

The Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112

The Examiner has rejected Claims 6, 11, and 12 under 35 U.S.C. 112 as being indefinite for lack of antecedent basis. With regard to Claim 11, Applicant has amended the claim to depend from Claim 10 as suggested by the Examiner. Applicant appreciates the Examiner's suggestion. With regard to Claims 6 and 12, Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections.

Both Claims 6 and 12 are in proper Markush group format according to MPEP section 2173.05(h). See *Ex Parte Markush*, 1925 C.D. 126 (Comm'r Pat. 1925). The term "the group" is an inherent characteristic of the listed alternate elements in the dependent claims. Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

Allowable Subject Matter

The Examiner indicated that Claims 9, 16, and 17 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claim. As suggested by the Examiner, Applicant has amended Claim 1, being the base claim, and included all of the limitations of Claim 9. Claim 9 has been cancelled. The Examiner's assistance in accurately describing allowable subject matter is gratefully acknowledged.

Claims 2-4, 6-8, and 10-17 depend from amended Claim 1, which the Examiner has indicated is allowable as amended. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that dependent Claims 2-4, 6-8, and 10-17 are also allowable.

Applicant has amended Claim 18 to include the limitations of Claim 1, as amended, which Applicant believes should make Claim 18 allowable. Claims 19 and 20 depend from amended Claim 18. Applicant respectfully submits that dependent Claims 19 and 20 are also allowable.

Applicant has also amended Claim 21 to include the limitations of Claim 1, as amended, which Applicant believes should make Claim 21 allowable.

CONCLUSION

Applicant has made a diligent effort to address the objections and rejections identified by the Examiner and respectfully submits that the outstanding objections and rejections in the Office Action have been overcome. In view of the above amendments and remarks, all pending claims are believed to be patentable, and thus, the case is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, a Notice of Allowability is respectfully requested at the Examiner's earliest convenience. In the event that there is any question concerning this response, or the application in general, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner contact Applicant's attorney at the telephone number listed below so that additional changes may be discussed.

Respectfully submitted,

Date

Jeffrey C. Maynard, Reg. No. 46,208

Attorney for Applicant

WHITEFORD, TAYLOR & PRESTON L.L.P.

Seven Saint Paul Street

Baltimore, Maryland 21202-1626

Phone: 410-347-9496 Fax: 410-347-9414

1572896